JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332) 1 United States Attorney 2 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CSBN 163973) 3 Chief, Criminal Division NICOLE KIM (NYBN 4435806) 4 Assistant United States Attorney 5 450 Golden Gate Ave. San Francisco, California 94102 6 Telephone: (415) 436-6401 7 Fax: (415) 436-6982 E-Mail: nicole.kim@usdoj.gov 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff 9 10 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 14 15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, No. CR 08-0083 PJH 16 Plaintiff, [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING 17 TIME FROM SPEEDY TRIAL ACT COMPUTATION 18 GUILLERMO ALEJANDRO 19 ZARAGOZA, et al; 20 Defendants. 21 22 The parties appeared before the Court on March 12, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. All eleven 23 defendants were in custody. Defendant Guillermo Zaragoza appeared with his attorney Eric 24 Hairston; defendant Manuel Corona also appeared with attorney Eric Hairston, who appeared 25 specially for attorney Nina Wilder; defendant Irma Corona appeared with her attorney Garrick 26 Lew; defendant Paul Kozina appeared with his attorney John Cline; defendant David Quezada 27 appeared with his attorney Steve Teich; defendant Angelica Rodriguez appeared with her

Speedy Trial Act Order U.S. v. Guillermo Zaragoza, et. al (08-0083 PJH)

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18 19 20

17

22 23

21

25 26

24

27

28

attorney Seth Chazin; defendant Martel Valencia appeared with his attorney Robert Waggener; defendant Eduardo Zaragoza appeared with his attorney Claire Leary; defendant Martin Zaragoza appeared with his attorney Gail Shiffman; and defendant Richard Parodi appeared with attorney Michelle Thomas, who appeared specially for attorney Douglas Rappaport. Defendant David Weld was not present and his appearance was waived by his attorney Brian Berson. In addition, defendant Roberto Ruiz remains at-large, defendant Lorenzo Carbajal is in state custody and a writ has been submitted to produce the defendant on this matter, and defendant Juan Zaragoza was arrested on February 27, 2008 in the Eastern District of California and is currently in transit to this district. Attorney Robert Lyons was also present and represented to the Court that he may become counsel of record for defendant Martel Valencia at the request of the defendant's family.

At the March 12, 2008, the parties jointly requested a continuance of this case until May 21, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. The parties agreed in open Court, with their attorney's concurrence, that the case should be declared factually complex. The parties represented that the underlying investigation involves multiple wiretaps with most of the wire interceptions in Spanish. In addition, several thousands of pages of discovery have already been produced or in the process of being produced. This discovery includes audio calls from the wire interceptions as well as draft transcripts of the interceptions. Accordingly, the parties agreed, the entire period from the inception of this case through and including May 21, 2008, should be excluded from the otherwise applicable Speedy Trial Act computation, because the factual complexity renders it unreasonable to expect adequate and effective preparation for pretrial proceedings and for the trial within the otherwise applicable time limits set forth in the Speedy Trial Act.

Based upon the above-described representations and the parties's agreement in open Court, the Court FINDS THAT the ends of justice served by granting a continuance from the inception of this case through and including May 21, 2008 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial, and that the case is so factually complex, due to the number of defendants and the nature of the prosecution, that it is unreasonable to expect effective and adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings and for the trial within the otherwise applicable time limits set forth in the Speedy Trial Act, within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)

and (B)(ii) and (iv).

Accordingly, the Court ORDERS THAT:

- 1. This case is continued to May 21, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. for further status and for possible setting of motions and trial dates.
- 2. The period from the inception of this case through and including May 21, 2008 is excluded from the otherwise applicable Speedy Trial Act computation, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §

3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(ii) and (iv).



Dated: March <u>14</u>, 2008